

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview on March 28, 2006. During the interview, claim 1 was discussed in view of the Graham and Pellar references. Applicant pointed out that it is not improper to attack references individually when the purpose of that attack is to show that the individual reference fails to teach that which the Examiner asserts. Further, Applicant pointed out that while Pellar may teach using different screen angles, it does not teach using screen angles which are different than a detected screen angle. Since Pellar never teaches detecting the screen angle, it would be impossible for it to teach using a dither pattern with a screen angle which is different than any detected screen angle. The Examiner admitted that Applicant had a valid argument and indicated that he would reconsider the rejection upon the filing of a formal response.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 18, 19, 24, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, U.S. Patent No. 5,821,915 in view of Pellar, U.S. Patent No. 4,196,451. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “a set up unit selecting from a plurality of dither patterns a dither pattern with a screen angle different from the detected screen angle and setting up the dither pattern.”

The Examiner asserts that this claim limitation contains two parts, the first being detecting the screen angle and the second being selecting a dither pattern with a screen angle different from the detected screen angle. The Examiner asserts that Graham teaches the first part and that Pellar teaches the second part. However, as discussed during the interview of March 28, 2006, this is not true. Pellar does not actually teach selecting a dither pattern with a screen angle different from the detected screen angle because Pellar never detects the screen angle. One cannot select a screen angle different from a detected screen angle if one never detects the screen angle. Pellar may teach the use of “different” screen angles, but this is not the same as using a screen angle different from the detected screen angle.


Thus, since Pellar fails to teach that which the Examiner asserts, the features of claim 1 cannot be taught or suggested by Graham and Pellar individually or in combination.

The remaining independent claims are allowable for the same reason claim 1 is allowable. The dependent claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772012000.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753